DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 192 UD 016 160

AUTHOR	de Cintron, Celia Fernandez; Vales, Pedro A.
TITLE	Social Dynamics of Return Migration to Puerto Rico.
INSTITUTION	Puerto Rico Univ., Rio Piedras. Social Science Research Center.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	98p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Environment; *Cultural Factors; Ethnic Groups; *Immigrants; Migrants; Migration; *Migration Patterns; Minority Groups; Puerto Rican Culture; *Puerto Ricans; *Relocation; Social Behavior; *Social Factors; Social Problems; Social Structure; Social Systems; Sociocultural Patterns; Spanish Americans; Spanish Speaking; Transportation; Travel
IDENTIFIERS	*Puerto Rico

ABSTRACT

The sociological elements associated with the process of return migration such as the motivations responsible for, or associated not only with return migration but with the migration process in general, are addressed in this investigation. Among the questions that guide the research problem are the following: the meaning of migration and of return migration; what comparisons can be made with the way of living, SES, and occupational status at the different stages of the migrants, such as before the first trip, during migration, last trip, and on return to Puerto Rico; and, what motivated the migrants to leave Puerto Rico in the first place and to return at last. Among the findings are the following: out of 236 subjects, 120 are males and 116 females ranging from 14 to over 65 years old with a median age of 35. Those migrants with a history of repeated migration have an average of three trips per person. Most of the travelling is done to New York, but New Jersey, Connecticut, Chicago, and Boston are also host communities to the Puerto Ricans. Work opportunities in Puerto Rico are limited at the time prior to the migrant's first departure. Males migrate more than females for economic reasons; females are moved by personal motives. The process of returning to Puerto Rico is influenced by strength of family ties. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

5

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED126192

CELIA FERNANDEZ DE CINTRON—PEDRO A. VALES

SOCIAL DYNAMICS OF RETURN MIGRATION TO PUERTO RICO

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES SOCIALES UNIVERSIDAD DE PUERTO RICO

UD016160

2

UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO
Rio Piedras Campus
Social Science Research Center

Social Dynamics of Return Migration to Puerto Rico

By

Prof. Celia Fernández de Cintrón *

Prof. Pedro A. Vales **

Revised
1975

---

* Psychologist, Research Associate, Social Science Research Center, University of Puerto Rico.

** Sociologist, Director, Social Science Research Center, Univeristy of Puerto Rico.

Table of Content

Pages

Acknowledgment.................................... i

Index of Tables.................................... iii

Introduction.................................... 1

I. Survey Findings and Analysis.................................... 6

A. General Demographic Information.................................... 6

1. Age and Sex Distribution.................................... 6
2. School Achievement.................................... 8
3. Civil Status.................................... 13
4. Role of Interviewee.................................... 16
5. Geographic Analysis (by place of origin, areas and municipalities).................................... 22

B. Migration Experience.................................... 36

1. Traveling Experience.................................... 36
2. Places Traveled to.................................... 38
3. Trainings Acquired.................................... 40
4. English Language Proficiency before First Trip.................................... 42
5. Job Experience of Migrants.................................... 43
6. Occupational Analysis.................................... 47
7. Income Analysis.................................... 59

C. Analysis of Motivational Factors on Migration.. 65

1. Motivations to Migrate.................................... 65
2. Motivations to Return.................................... 71

II. Summary.................................... 75

III. Implications.................................... 78

References.................................... 82

Selected Bibliography on Puerto Rican Migration.... 83

Acknowledgment

Although this study of the Social Dynamics of Return Migration to Puerto Rico is a limited piece of research, it has had the contribution of many scholars and officials. We would like to express our appreciation to at least some of them, for it will be impossible to mention all. Dr. John Macisco, Jr., Demographer and Vice Chairman of the Sociology-Anthropology Department at Fordham University was of unmeasurable help, as well as Mr. Stephen Zell, economist, and Mrs. Edmé Doble, Director of the Social Planning Division, both from the Puerto Rico Planning Board. Prof. Miguel Valencia from the Business Administration Faculty, and Prof. Nemesio Vargas from the Social Science Research Center, were of great assistance.

Special recognition is due to Prof. Raûl Santiago Melêndez who was co-director with Prof. Cintrôn of the original research project in this field. It was his valuable work in the analyzing of the early data and preparing the preliminary report that helped point the way for the pilot project which has culminated in this book.

Our most sincere thanks to the people who had to do the menial and hard work, the groups of interviewers who worked with enthusiasm and responsibility to get their duties done: Miss Delia Torres, Mr. Heli Collazos, Mr. Noel Mattei, Mr. Luis Sânchez, Mr. Milton Aldarondo, and the Secretarial Staff of the Social Science Research Center. Finally, our deepest gratitude to the persons interviewed for their hospitality and collaboration.

Whatever contribution this study may provide, it is the result of having had the cooperation of all the persons mentioned,

and of others who in one way or another were participants in this research. However, all limitation, errors or misinterpretations are strict responsibilities of the authors.

Celia Fernández Cintrón

Pedro A. Vales

Index of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page
1	Distribution of Sample by Age and Sex: 1973........................	8
2	Distribution of Sample by Age, Sex and Education: 1973..............	11-12
3	Distribution of Sample by Civil Status and Age: 1973................	15
4	Distribution of Sample by Sex and Civil Status: 1973................	16
5	Distribution of Sample by Role of Interviewee and by Sex: 1973.........	17
6	Distribution of Heads of Households in Terms of Age and Size of the Family: 1973........................	18
7	Distribution of Heads of Households by Age Brackets, Sex and Size of Family: 1973........................	20
8	Size of Family by Age Groups, Sex, and Heads of Households: 1973........	21
9	Percentual Distribution of Puerto Rico Population and Research Sample by Size of Municipality: 1970...........	23
10	Numerical and Percentual Distribution of Sample by Regions and Zones of Origin..............................	24
11	Distribution of Sample by Sex and Region of Origin Before First Trip....	26
12	Distribution of Return Migrants' Specific Place of Birth by Residential Zone and Municipality.................	27-28
13	Distribution of Return Migrants by Actual Residential Zone and Municipality..............................	32-33

Table No.	Title	Page
14	Distribution of Sample by Specific Residential Zone at Place of Birth and Sex	34
15	Distribution of Sample by Actual Residential Zone and by Sex	34
16	Comparative Percentual Distribution of Present Specific Zone of Residence and Specific Zone of Birth	35
17	Movement from Rural to Urban Setting (Females)	35
18	Movement from Urban Areas to Rural Areas	35
19	Number of Trips by Years	36
20	Distribution of Return Migrants by Number of Trips Made and by Sex	37
21	Distribution of Return Migrants to Place Traveled to on the First and Last Trip to the U. S.	39
22	Migrants' Knowledge of English Prior First and Last Migratory Experience to U. S. A., by Sex	43
23	Distribution of Labor Force Status of Migrants Prior Migration, after Returning from First Trip and Present Status.	46
24	Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico before First Trip with Present Occupational Categories	55
25	Comparison of Migrants in Terms or Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico before First Trip with Occupations in U. S. First Trip	56
26	Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in U.S. First Time with Occupations in U.S. Last Time	

Table No.	Title	Page
27	Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in Present Occupations in Puerto Rico with Occupations in U.S. Last Time	58
28	Distribution of Adjusted Median Income per Month for the Puerto Rican Return Migrants at Different Stages of the Migration Process	61
29	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex before First Trip to U.S	62
30	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex During First Trip to U.S	62
31	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex after Returning from First Trip to U.S	63
32	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex before Last Trip to U.S	63
33	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex During Last Trip to U.S	64
34	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex after Returning from Last Trip to U.S	64
35	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex at Time of Interview: 1973	65

Table No.	Title	Page
36	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Reasons for Leaving Puerto Rico in the First Trip, by Sex	69
37	Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Reasons for Leaving Puerto Rico in the Last Trip, by Sex	70
38	Distribution of Return Migrants by Reasons Given to Return to Puerto Rico after the First Trip by Sex	73
39	Distribution of Return Migrants by Reasons Given to Return to Puerto Rico after the Last Trip by Sex	74

Introduction

The field of migration has received very little attention in the last few decades in Puerto Rico, even though we have experienced it in a profound way. As of 1970,[1/] 1,500,000 of our Puerto Rican people were living in the United States. That amount was more than half our population (2,712,033) in Puerto Rico for that same year. Precisely, 13%[2/] of the Puerto Rican Population 14 years old and over in Puerto Rico in 1970 has lived in the United States as of 1965.

What seemed at the beginning as a one-way migration started to shape a different view as early as 1960. Nevertheless, only one significant research study on return migration was conducted by Dr. José Hernández Alvarez, and since then very few works have been published,[3/] although some research has taken place on the general concept of migration.

In early 1973, the Puerto Rico Planning Board submitted a proposal to H.U.D., Urban Planning Grant, in order to do a comprehensive study of migration. As a result, one of the areas of interest was a pilot study on return migrants, which was contracted with the Social Science Research Center. The funds granted for this study proceeded from Contract C P A - R O - 02 - 10366 with H.U.D., under the provisions of Section 701 of the 1954 Act, as ammended.

As we have indicated, the objective of both agencies was to do an initial study that would shed light on the sociological elements associated to the process of return migration. The idea of a socio-dynamic study of return migration developed from previous research, such as Hernández's which had been highly demographic and was based on census data. Although we felt this is a valid and reliable data, we wanted to search into some of the motivations responsible for, or associated not only to return migration, but to the migration process in general. As is understandable, this information is not contained in the U.S. Census Report. Thus, this study provides some insights into an area unsearched before, and on which very little information is available. Furthermore, our own limitations on funds and time impeded a project beyond an exploratory level. Nevertheless, both the Puerto Rico Planning Board and the University of Puerto Rico Social Research Center, are conscious of the urgent need for more diversified and comprehensive research about the migration processes. It will be our goal, and our commitment, to propose, design and develop further research that will try to provide explanations to the inquiries provoked by the findings in this pilot study.

Research Problem:

The term migration has been traditionally used to imply the mobility of residence of individuals. Puerto Rican Migration carries the connotation of a massive move of Puerto Ricans from the Island to other places, specially U.S., and particularly to New York, in order to establish themselves there. Previous observations were limited to the Farm Migrant, who would migrate on a very temporary basis, for a period of five or six months, during harvesting times and then return to Puerto Rico for the fall and winter. In both cases, the concept of migration has been used to imply a movement of individuals across national or geographical boundaries. It has also been used to indicate the process of internal shifting of residence within one society, such as rural-urban migration, small town- metropolitan area migration, etc.

Since our project is rather limited to a group of persons that have traveled across boundary lines, and then return, we have had to set some limits to the concept. Return migrants, operationally defined, are those Puerto Ricans, born in Puerto Rico and of Puerto Rican parents, who have lived outside of Puerto Rico for at least three months of their life, and who return to Puerto Rico after 1965. Furthermore, our target population had to be restricted to persons 14 years of age, or older, since our objective goes beyond the process of just enumerating migrants.

Thus, our Research problem could be guided by the following questions:

1. What is the meaning of migration and of return migration as experienced by a group of persons that have lived through it?
2. What comparison could be made of the way of living, socio-economic standings, occupational status, etc., at the different stages of the migrants, such as before first trip, during migration, last trip, and upon return to Puerto Rico?

3. Where do migrants go to, and why?
4. Who are the return migrants?
5. Where did the return migrants come from in Puerto Rico, and where do they establish themselves upon return?
6. What particular problems did they encounter throughout the whole process?
7. What motivated them to leave Puerto Rico in the first place, and to return at last?

These questions are our research problem, and the answers that we get shall provide some knowledge to the understanding of the process, as well as some guidelines for future research.

Sample Studied:[*]

Our sample consisted of 236 return migrants, 14 years and older, and who had returned to Puerto Rico after 1965. In fact, the sample was restricted to returnees from 1965 to April 1972, time on which a survey was conducted in order to identify the population and to choose the sample.

The survey was conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, Government of Puerto Rico. The B.L.S. conducts a monthly survey on different household samples in Puerto Rico. The April survey is a residential survey. The Puerto Rico Planning Board designed a questionnaire that included the migration questions, and was used in the April 1972 survey. The sample studied was drawn from a listing of people who had lived outside of Puerto

---

[*] Prof. Miguel Valencia, School of Business Administration, University of Puerto Rico, was responsible for the sampling procedure of this project.

Rico for three months or more, who were 14 years of age or older, and who had Puerto Rican parentage. It should be noted, also, that this household survey is carried on throughout the Island, thus the sample selected represents that particular population of Return Migrants in Puerto Rico. Since the population was relatively high for our resources and time, one out of every two return migrants was selected for this pilot study.

This sample of Return Migrants was interviewed in 1973, using an interview schedule which contained open-ended questions, as to allow for the required flexibility in a pilot study. The interview schedule contained questions related to the following areas:*

1. General Demographic Information: such as age, sex, educational background, civil status, knowledge of English language, etc.;
2. Migration experience;
3. Motivational factors related to the migratory experience.

---

* Copies of the interview schedule used are available at the Social Science Research Center upon request.

I. Survey Findings and Analysis:

A. General Demographic Information:

The sample studied, which was drawn out of the larger migratory population, consists of 236 interviewees. There are 120 males and 116 females. The interviwees renge in age from 14 to over 65 years old, with a median age of 32.0 years. Although it is not our contention that the return migrants should be representatives of the larger population, it does not differentiate significantly from its age and sex parameters. However, when comparing the median age of our sample with that obtained by Hernândez Alvarez, which was 29.5 years for all returnees, there seems to be a slight difference. Hernândez' population seems to be slightly younger than our population; nevertheless, there is no significant difference between the two populations.

1. The age and sex distribution for our sample is as follows:
   - a) 50.8% of the sample were males and 49.2% were females;
   - b) 27.8% were from 14 to 19 years of age and 13.6% 65 years old and over;
   - c) 43.3% were classified between 25 and 44 years of age, which precisely is supposed to be the most productive time in anybody's life;
   - d) If one considers the 25 to 44 years old bracket as a center distribution, for example, 29.7% are less than 24 years of age and 27.2% are over 45 years of age. Only 3.4% are over 65 years of age.

e) When classifying the sample by specific age brackets and by sex, the males and females tend to be similarly distributed.

(1) 11.2% of the females and 10.0 of the males are from 14 - 19 years old.

(2) 14.7% of the females and 23.3% of the males are from 20 to 24.

(3) 15.5% of the females and 15% of the males are from 25 - 29.

(4) 10.3% of the females and 10% of the males are from 30 to 34.

(5) 9.5% of the females and 7.5% of the males are from 35 - 39.

(6) 10.3% of the females and 8.3% of the males are from 40 - 44 years of age.

(7) 14.7% of the females and 12.5% of the males are from 45 to 54.

(8) 13.8% of the females and 13.4% of the males are 55 years old or over.

The following table provides a more descriptive view of the age and sex composition of the sample studied.

Table 1: Distribution of Sample by Age and Sex: 1973

Age	Females		Males		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
14 - 20	13	11.2	12	10.0	25	10.6
20 - 24	17	14.7	28	23.3	45	19.1
25 - 29	18	15.5	18	15.0	36	15.3
30 - 34	12	10.3	12	10.0	24	10.2
35 - 39	11	9.5	9	7.5	20	8.5
40 - 44	12	10.3	10	8.3	22	9.3
45 - 54	17	14.7	15	12.5	32	13.6
55 - 64	10	8.6	14	11.7	24	10.2
65+	6	5.2	2	1.7	8	3.4
TOTAL	116	100.0	120	100.0	236	100.0

2. School Achievement:

The analysis reveals that 18.6% of the sample could be classified as functional illiterates. At the same time, 22.04% had not gone beyond elementary education (4-6), 22.45% studied to the level of Jr. High, and 33.90% had studied to the High School level. It should be noticed that almost 3% (2.97%) of the sample had studied beyond the High School level. The median of education (both sexes) is 7.72 years of schooling.

The classification of the data by age and sex provides a more complete analysis.

Of the 96 people (40.68%) who had not studied beyond the 6th grade, 52.1% were males and 47.9% females. Furthermore, 12 of the 50 males (24%) were from 14 to 24 years old, 21 (or 42%) were from 25 - 44, and 17 (or 34%) were 45 years or older. Of the 43 (18.64%) functional illiterates (had not gone beyond 3rd grade) 18 were males and 25 were females. Of the 18 males 55.5% were over 45 years of age, and of the 25 females 76% were in the same age bracket.

Of the 53 people in Junior High School level, 30 are males and 23 females. Of the 30 males 9 (or 30%) were from 14 to 24 years, and 14 (46.7%) were from 25 to 44 years old, only 23.3% (7) were 45 years or over. Of the 23 females, 4 (17.4%) were from 14 to 24, 18 (78.3%) from 25 to 44, and 2 (8.7%) 45 years or older.

The median education for all the females is 8.35 years and for all the males 7.4 years. The median for all persons in our sample 25 years old or over, is 6.4 for both sexes, 7.4 for the males and 5.8 for the females. The median scholastic achievement for the general population in the same categories is 6.7 according to the Planning Board official data and 6.9 in the 1970 Census.

Of those who had some high school education (80), 45 were females and 35 were males. Of the 35 males, 48.6% (17) were 14 to 24 years old, 10 (28.6%) were 25 - 44, and 20% (7) were 45 or over. Of the 45 females, 51.1% (23) were 14 to 24 years old, 22 (48.9%) were 25 to 44, and none were above 45 years of age.

Of the eight people who had completed 13 years or more of schooling, 6 are males and 2 females. Two of the six males are 14 to 24, and the other four are 25 to 44. Of the two females, one is 25 to 44, and the other one is in the 45 years or over bracket. We should note from this analysis that there seems to be a negative correlation between age and formal education.

The following table provides a complete description of the interaction between age, sex and school achievement.

Table 2: Distribution of Sample by Age, Sex and Education Age Group and Sex: 1973

School Achievement	Less than 20				20 - 24				25 - 29				30 - 34				35 - 39			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0 - 3	0	.00	0	.00	1	3.57	0	.00	1	5.56	1	5.56	0	.00	1	8.33	4	44.44	2	18.18
4 - 5	2	16.67	1	7.69	2	7.14	0	.00	3	16.67	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	11.11	0	.00
6	2	16.67	0	.00	5	17.86	2	11.76	2	11.11	3	16.67	1	8.33	0	.00	2	22.22	2	18.18
7 - 8	3	25.00	0	.00	3	10.71	0	.00	2	11.11	1	5.56	8	66.67	7	58.33	1	11.11	2	18.18
9	2	16.67	3	23.08	1	3.57	1	5.88	1	5.56	3	16.67	0	.00	2	16.67	0	.00	2	18.18
10 - 11	2	16.67	7	53.85	7	25.00	5	29.41	3	16.67	4	22.22	1	8.33	1	8.33	1	11.11	2	18.18
12	1	8.33	2	15.38	7	25.00	9	52.94	4	22.22	6	33.33	0	.00	1	8.33	0	.00	1	9.09
13+	0	.00	0	.00	2	7.14	0	.00	2	11.11	0	.00	2	16.67	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Total	12	100.00	13	100.00	28	100.00	17	100.00	18	100.00	18	100.00	12	100.00	12	100.00	9	100.00	11	100.00

Continued: Table 2

School Achievement	40 - 44				45 - 54				55 - 64				65+				Total			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0 - 3	2	20.00	2	16.67	4	26.67	6	35.29	5	35.71	9	90.00	1	50.00	4	66.67	18	15.00	25	21.55
4 - 5	1	10.00	0	.00	2	13.33	7	41.18	4	28.57	1	10.00	0	.00	1	16.67	15	12.50	10	8.62
6	4	40.00	1	8.33	1	6.67	1	5.88	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	16.67	17	14.17	10	8.62
7 - 8	1	10.00	0	.00	4	26.67	2	11.76	2	14.29	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00	25	20.83	12	10.34
9	1	10.00	1	8.33	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	4.17	12	10.34
10 - 11	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	14	11.67	19	16.38
12	1	10.00	7	58.33	4	26.67	0	.00	3	21.43	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	20	16.67	26	22.41
13+	0	.00	1	8.33	0	.00	1	5.88	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	5.00	2	1.72
Total	10	100.00	12	100.00	15	100.00	17	100.00	14	100.00	10	100.00	2	100.00	6	100.00	120	100.00	116	100.00

3. Civil Status:

The analysis of the data in terms of civil status reveals that 139 persons (58.9%) are married with the partner present at the time of the interview. The remaining 97 (41.4%), were either not married or married with the counterpart member (husband or wife) absent. The not married category includes 21.19% (50) bachelors, 5.08% (12) divorced, 4.66% (11) formally separated, and 5.93% (14) widows. The married with partner absent category constituted a 3.4% (8), and the remaining two persons could not be classified in any of these categories.

Of the 139 people married, 25 (18%) are from 14 to 24 years old, 74 (53.2%) are 25 to 44, and 40 (28.8%) are 45 years or older. Of the 50 single people 38 (76%) are from 14 to 24 years old, 11 (22%) are 25 to 44, and only one is above 45 years of age. There were 12 people divorced, of which 16.7% (2) were 14 to 24 years old, 58.3% (7) were 25 - 44, and 3 (25%) were 45 years or above. Of the 11 persons formally separated 2 (18.2%) are less than 24 years old 5 (45.4%) are from 25 - 44, and 4 (36.4%) are 45 years or older. Just about every one of the 14 widow is 45 years or older [13 (92.9%)] with the exception of one, who is in the 25 to 44 years old category. Of the eight people married whose partners were absent, 2 (25%) are 14 to 24, 4 (50%) are 25 to 44, and the remaining two (25%) are 45 years old or over. Of the people who could not be classified within these categories, one was in the 14 to 24 category, and the other one is in the 45 years or above category.

It is evident that the great majority of the younger people, 14 to 24 years of age (54.3%), is single. A high proportion (72.5%) of the 25 to 44 years of age is married. Similarly, 40 persons (62.5%) of the 45 years or older are married. Close to 52% of the divorced or separated fall within the age bracket of 25 to 44 years old. At the same time, as we mentioned before, 92.9% of the widows are persons 45 years old or over.

Civil Status by Sex Distribution:

In terms of sex distribution, the civil status data reveals that 79 (65.83%) males were married with the partner present and 60 females (51.72%) are in the same category. With the partner absent, although married, appear 6 females (5.17%) and 2 males (1.67%); 18 females (15.52%), and 32 males (26.67%) are bachelors; 7 females (6.03%) and 5 males (4.17%) are divorced; 11 females (9.48%) were separated; 14 females (12.07%) were widows, and 2 males (1.67%) were engaged in a consensual relationship. There were no males separated or widowers.

Table 3: Distribution of Sample by Civil Status and Age: 1973

	Civil Status															
Age	Married Partner Present		Married Partner Absent		Single		Divorced		Separated		Widow		Others		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
-20	4	1.69	1	0.42	20	8.47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.42	25	10.59
20 - 24	21	8.89	1	0.42	18	7.62	2	0.84	2	0.84	0	0	1	0.42	45	19.06
25 - 29	26	11.01	1	0.42	6	2.54	1	0.42	1	0.42	1	0.42	0	0	36	15.25
30 - 34	19	8.05	1	0.42	1	0.42	2	0.84	1	0.42	0	0	0	0	24	10.16
35 - 39	10	4.23	1	0.42	4	1.69	2	0.84	3	1.27	0	0	0	0	20	8.47
40 - 44	19	8.05	1	0.42	0	0	2	0.84	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	9.32
45 - 54	20	8.47	1	0.42	1	0.42	3	1.27	1	0.42	5	2.11	1	0.42	32	13.55
55 - 64	16	6.77	1	0.42	0	0	0	0	3	1.27	4	1.69	0	0	24	10.16
65+	4	1.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1.69	0	0	8	3.38
TOTAL	139	58.85	8	3.36	50	21.16	12	5.05	11	4.64	14	5.91	2	0.84	236	99.9
14 - 24	25	18.0	2	25.0	38	76.0	2	16.7	2	18.2	0	0	1	50.00	70	29.7
25 - 44	74	53.2	4	50.0	11	22.0	7	58.3	5	45.4	1	7.1	0	0	102	43.2
45+	40	28.8	2	25.0	1	2.0	3	25.0	4	36.4	13	92.9	1	50.0	64	27.1
TOTAL	139	58.9	8	3.4	50	21.2	12	5.1	11	4.7	14	5.9	2	.8	236	100.0

Table 4: Distribution of Sample by Sex and Civil Status: 1973

Civil Status	Female		Male		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Married	60	51.72	79	65.83	139	59.90
Married Partner Absent	6	5.17	2	1.67	8	3.39
Bachelor	18	15.52	32	26.67	50	21.19
Divorced	7	6.03	5	4.17	12	5.08
Separated	11	9.48	0	.00	11	4.66
Widow	14	12.07	0	.00	14	15.93
Others	0	.00	2	1.67	2	1.85
TOTAL	116	99.99	120	100.01	236	100.00

4. Role of Interviewee:

The distribution of the sample in terms of the role of interviewee indicates that there were 114 (48.3%) persons as family heads (these were persons mainly in charge of the economic responsibility of the household), 72 (30.2%) were dependent spouses, 44 (18.64%) were dependent children, 4 (1.69%) had other familiar relationships, and 2 (.85%) had no relation at all with the head of the household, except staying there (both cases were transitional situations).

Of the 114 included in the "family head category", 84 (70%) are males, and 30 (25.86%) are females. Of the 72 dependent partners, 12 (10%) are males, and 51.72% (60) are females. The dependent children were more or less evenly distributed 23 (19.17%) males and 21 (18.1%) females. Of those in other type of family relationships, all of them were females, and, finally, in the "no relation category" were 1 male (.83%) and 1 female (.86%). See next table for specific details.

Table 5: Distribution of Sample by Role of Interviewee and by Sex: 1973

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Family Head	84	70.00	30	25.86	114	48.31
Dependent Spouse	12	10.00	60	51.72	72	30.51
Dependent Children	23	19.17	21	18.10	44	18.64
Other	0	.00	4	3.45	4	1.69
No Relation	1	.83	1	.86	2	.85
TOTAL	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

Our next analysis studies the relation between age and size of the family of those interviewees categorized as heads of households.*

---

* The concept of "head of household" is used instead of family head in order to be able to include as performing that role not only the family heads, but also the dependent spouse or relative who is responsible for the overall management of the household.

Table 6: Distribution of Heads of Households in Terms of Age and Size of the Family:* 1973

Size of Family	Age of Head of Household									
	-20		20 - 34		35 - 44		45+		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 - 3	2	50.0	38	49.3	12	31.6	38	62.3	90	50.00
4 - 5	2	50.0	33	42.9	12	31.6	15	24.6	62	34.4
6 - 8	0	0	6	7.8	11	28.9	8	13.1	25	13.9
9+	0	0	0	0	3	7.9	0	0	3	1.7
TOTAL	4	100.0 2.2	77	100.0 42.8	38	100.0 21.1	61	100.0 33.9	180	100.0

As it may be seen, the majority of the families have from 1 to 3 members, even those in the 45 years old or over category. In the 1 to 3 members category are included 90 (50%) of the 180 heads of households. The 20 to 34 and the 45 or more specific age brackets have the highest frequency with 38 subjects in each.

Over 70% of the sample have families of 5 or less members and very few, 5 (2.1%), have families with 9 or more members, even though rural residence is more frequent in our sample, which could provide a different expectation.

The sex distribution of heads of households by family size and age brackets reveals that, in the 1 to 3 members category, there are 44 males and 46 females, (50.57% and 49.46% respectively). In the 4 to 5 members category, we found 23 males and 39 females (26.44% and 41.94% respectively). In the 6 to 8 category, there are 17 (19.54%) males and 8 (8.6%) females. There are only 3 males heads of households in the 9 or more members category.

---

* Although we have used the concept of "head of household" as a unit of analysis, when referring to the household composition and membership, we have used the concept of family size interchangeably with it, without carrying a different meaning.

Our analysis reveals that, although there were no males in the 20 years old or younger category, there were 4 females; 50% of them are in the 1 to 3 family members bracket, and the remaining 2 in the 4 to 5 family members bracket. In the 20 to 34 age bracket, there are 40 males and 37 females, of which 24 males (60%) have families in the 1 to 3 members category, and another 14 (35%) are in the 4 to 5 members category. In the case of the 37 females, 14 (37.84%) have families in the 1 to 3 members category, 19 (51.35%) in the 4 to 5 members, and the remaining 4 (10.81%) are in the 6 to 8 members category.

For both males and females, the median is around 3.5 members per household. In terms of sex distribution, we find an average family size of 3.466 for males and 3.525 for females.

The following table illustrates the distribution of heads of households by age group, sex, and family size.

Table 7: Distribution of Heads of Households by Age Brackets, Sex, and Size of Family: 1973

Size of Family	Age Brackets																			
	Less than 20				20 - 34				35 - 44				45+				Total			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 - 3	0	0	2	50.00	24	60.00	14	37.84	1	6.25	11	50.00	19	61.29	19	63.33	44	50.57	46	49.46
4 - 5	0	0	2	50.00	14	35.00	19	51.35	3	18.75	9	40.91	6	19.35	9	30.00	23	26.44	39	41.94
6 - 8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	4	10.81	9	56.25	2	9.09	6	19.35	2	6.67	17	19.54	8	8.60
9+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3.45	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	4	100.00	40	100.00	37	100.00	16	100.00	22	100.00	31	100.00	30	100.00	87	100.00	93	100.00

Table 8: Size* of Family by Age Groups, Sex and Heads of Households: 1973

Size of Family	Age									
	Less than 20		20 - 34		35 - 44		45+		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1 - 3	0	2	24	14	1	11	19	19	44	46
4 - 5	0	2	14	19	3	9	6	9	23	39
6 - 8	0	0	2	4	9	2	6	2	17	8
9+	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
TOTAL	0	4	40	37	16	22	31	30	87	93

---

* Dependent family member could be living in or out of the household.

5. Geographical Analysis (place of origin, area & municipality)

An analysis of the place of origin of the return migrants, reveals that the 236 subjects proceed from 55 towns or municipalities in Puerto Rico. In fact, 71.4% of the 77 Island towns were represented.

A comparison between the towns or municipalities in Puerto Rico with those represented by the sample shows that, there is a tendency for a higher out migration of people proceeding from small towns than from large cities. Our analysis reveals that, although the towns with 25,000 population or less represent 28.6% of Puerto Rico's population, they accounted for 38.56% of the return migrants studied, which is in fact a disproportional participation of these small towns in the migration process. At the same time the larger cities (200,000 persons or more) represent 17.08% of the total Puerto Rican population, however, accounting for only 8.9% of the migrant sampled.

Obviously, one can infer that there seems to exist some differential factors or conditions associated with the migratory movements in both, the larger municipalities and the smallest ones.

Table 9: Percentual Distribution of Puerto Rico Population and Research Sample by Size of Municipality: 1970

	Size of Municipality				
Population	25,000 or less	25,001 50,000	50,001 100,000	100,001 200,000	200,001 463,000
Puerto Rico	28.64	24.93	13.76	15.59	17.08
Research Sample	38.56	25.42	17.37	9.75	8.90

It should be noted in the previous table that the percentual difference between population and sample in the municipalities of 25,000 or less is of 10%, thus over representing the return migrants in terms of their place of origin. At the same time the percentual difference in the largest population bracket (200,001 - 463,000) is of 8.18%, under representing the sample. In fact, one can see that the smaller three population size brackets tend to over represent the return migrant sample, while the two largest population samples over represent the population.

It is even more interesting if one knows the geographical configuration of Puerto Rico. It is well known that most of the smallest towns have a much higher rural population, as well as lower economic conditions than the larger cities. As a matter of fact, we would like to suggest the possibility of a correlation between socio-economic conditions and migration as a hypothesis that may be tested in a future study. This hypothesis is based on the fact that the smaller towns happen to be the less economically developed ones in Puerto Rico. In addition they have been in a consistent decrease of population in the last two decades.

An inspection of the sample distribution by zone shows that, although there may exist a ratio of 2 to 1 migrants in terms of rural-urban origin by zones, in the Island Center Region the ratio is of almost 4 to 1.

Table 10: Numerical and Percentual Distribution of Sample by Regions and Zones of Origin

Regions and Zones	Distribution	
Metropolitan Area	Frequency	Per Cent
Urban	43	18.22
Rural	19	8.05
Sub - Total	62	26.27
Island Center		
Urban	11	4.66
Rural	38	16.10
Sub - Total	49	20.76
Island Coast		
Urban	37	15.68
Rural	88	37.29
Sub - Total	125	52.97
Puerto Rico		
Urban	91	38.56
Rural	145	61.44
TOTAL	236	100.00

From the preceeding table it is evident that two out of every three return migrants proceeded from rural zones. Furthermore, of the 91 persons that proceeded from the urban zones, almost half (47.25%) were from the San Juan Metropolitan Area alone.

When distributing the sample by sex and zone of origin, we find that there is no significant difference between males and females by urban or rural origin. In fact, 64% of the males and 59% of the females proceeded from rural zones. By the same token, 36% of the males and 41% of the females proceeded from urban zone.

The return migrants proceeded from different areas of the Island. The greatest proportion (50.0%) came from rural areas (non-government land). Secondly were urban areas residents (18.6%) [which were not the typically middle class residential areas, nor the slums, nor public housing residents]. This category reflects better the small adjacent suburban community. Thirdly were the people living in rural government granted land (11.4%); fourthly, people from urban slum areas (11.0%). There were 6.8% that lived in urban residential areas (typical middle class sectors), and lastly were people born and living on Public Housing Projects at the time of their first departure (1.3%).

See table 12 for a specific-zone distribution of migrants' place of birth by municipalities.

Table 11: Distribution of Sample by Sex and Region of Origin Before First Trip

Regions	Sex					
Metropolitan Area	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Urban	21	17.50	22	18.97	43	18.22
Rural	13	10.83	6	5.17	19	8.05
Sub - Total	34	28.33	28	24.14	62	26.27
Center of the Island						
Urban	7	5.83	4	3.44	11	4.66
Rural	21	17.50	17	14.66	38	16.10
Sub - Total	28	23.33	21	18.10	49	20.76
Island Coast						
Urban	15	12.50	22	18.97	37	15.68
Rural	43	35.83	45	38.79	88	37.29
Sub - Total	58	48.33	67	57.76	125	52.97
Puerto Rico						
Urban	43	35.8	48	41.4	91	38.6
Rural	77	64.2	68	58.6	145	61.4
TOTAL	120	100.0	116	100.0	236	100.0

Table 12: Distribution of Return Migrants' Specific Place of Birth by Residential Zone and Municipality

Municipalities	Residential Zones							
	Urban Slum Area	Urban Public Housing Project	Urban Resi-dential Area-M.C.	Other Urban Areas	Rural Land Granted Areas	Rural Others	No Inf.	Total
Adjuntas	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Aguada	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
Aguadilla	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	5
Aibonito	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	5
Añasco	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Arecibo	2	0	1	3	2	5	0	13
Barceloneta	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	4
Bayamón	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Cabo Rojo	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Caguas	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Camuy	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Cayey	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3
Ceiba	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Ciales	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Coamo	1	0	0	3	0	4	0	8
Comerío	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Guánica	2	0	1	3	0	2	0	8
Guayama	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Guayanilla	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Guaynabo	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Hatillo	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Hormigueros	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Humacao	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	6
Isabela	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Juana Díaz	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Juncos	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
Lares	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	4
Las Marías	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Las Piedras	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Luquillo	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	5
Manatí	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Maricao	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	4
Maunabo	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	6
Mayaguez	1	0	1	3	2	1	0	8
Moca	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Morovis	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5
Naguabo	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Orocovis	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

(Continued Table 12)

Municipalities	Residential Zones							
	Urban Slum Area	Urban Public Housing Project	Urban Resi- dential Area-M.C.	Other Urban Areas	Rural Land Granted Areas	Rural Others	No Inf.	Total
Peñuelas	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5
Ponce	3	2	2	3	0	5	0	15
Quebradillas	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Sabana Grande	0	0	1	1	1	4	0	7
Salinas	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
San Germán	2	0	0	1	1	4	0	8
San Juan	3	0	5	3	0	0	0	11
San Lorenzo	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	8
San Sebastián	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Santa Isabel	2	0	0	2	3	5	0	12
Toa Baja	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Utuado	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	6
Vieques	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Villalba	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Yabucoa	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Yauco	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	4
No inf. available	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
TOTAL FREQUENCY	26	3	16	44	27	118	2	236
PERCENTAGE	11.0%	1.3%	6.8%	18.6%	11.4%	50.0%	.9%	100.0%

In table 12 we could notice that out of 77 municipalities in the Island, 56 (or 72.7%) had been represented as place of birth. At the present time (1972), 55 municipalities are represented among the sample, which is equivalent to 71.4% of the 77 municipal distribution of Puerto Rico.

Of the original 56 municipalities of birth, 47 (or 83.93%) were represented in the actual residence of the sample. However, 8 new municipalities are included as places of present residence, which were not registered in the previous analysis of birth places. The new municipalities are: Arroyo, Dorado, Gurabo, Loiza, Rincón, Toa Alta, Trujillo Alto and Vega Baja. The nine municipalities that were birth places of the migrants, but on which no one lives at the present time are: Carolina, Ceiba, Ciales, Comerío, Isabela, Juana Díaz, Moca, Orocovis, and Vieques. It should be noticed that the new municipalities, with the exception of Arroyo and Rincón, are close to San Juan Metropolitan Area, while in the nine birth place municipalities that were not registered on the actual residence, with the exception of Carolina, all the others are located throughout the Island, away from San Juan.

However, as we had mentioned, the new addresses represent only 14.5% of the places of residence in 1972 which were not registered as place of birth of the return migrant.

The specific areas or zones in which the return migrants have established themselves differ somewhat from their places of birth. In fact, one can observe a tendency among return migrants to establish themselves in the urban centers even if they have established themselves within their own municipalities of birth. One thing that should be noted is that more people were living in the slum areas, Public Housing and Urban Residential areas, and less in the other areas of the urban setting. Among the rural population, the people who were born in other rural areas, which represent persons who own land, as well as those living on other people's land decreased, while there was an increase toward government granted lots. See table 13 for specific details.

Altogether, 26 females and 27 males are living in an area different from their place of birth. The 53 persons represent 22.46% of the total sample, which means that 77.54% maintained their municipal residence. However, the 53 persons who changed were enough to influence the trend toward urban residence which we already discussed.

In fact, and in order to provide a more complete portrait of these trends, we have analyzed the specific geographical movement of the sample. Of the 26 females, 8 moved from rural zones in various(6) municipalities to urban zones. Sixty two and a half per cent of those moved precisely into the San Juan Metropolitan Area. Among the 27 males, 66.7% moved from rural zone right into San Juan.

Overall, 54.7% of the 53 persons who changed their Place of Birth to different municipalities, established themselves in urban zones, while 45.3% moved or stayed in rural environments. See tables 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 for complete details related to residential moves of the return migrants.

The analysis of this data, reveals a trend toward urban settlement. This is true not only where a change of municipality takes place, but also when the migrant returns to the same municipality where he was born. The data indicates that 38.6% of the sample were born in urban environments and that, at the present time, 47.9% live in urban settings, registering an increase of (24 persons) 27.0%. Although 61.4% of the sample were born in rural settings, at the present time 52.1% of the sample live in rural areas. In fact, there are 22 persons less in rural environments at the present time than at the time of birth. The actual decrease is of 15.2%.

We must emphasize that, although there has been a significant trend toward urban location, 3 out of every 4 persons stayed in their municipal place of birth, while only one out of every four moved into a different municipality. See tables 12 to 18 for further details.

Table 13: Distribution of Return Migrants by Actual Residential Zone and Municipality

Municipalities	Residential Zones						
	Urban Slum Area	Urban Public Housing Project	Urban Resi-dential Area	Other Urban Areas	Rural Land Granted Areas	Rural Others	Total
Adjuntas	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Aguada	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Aguadilla	1	2	2	0	4	2	11
Aibonito	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Añasco	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Arecibo	1	3	1	2	4	0	11
Arroyo	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Barceloneta	2	0	0	1	0	1	4
Bayamón	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Cabo Rojo	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Caguas	0	2	3	0	0	3	8
Camuy	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Cayey	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Coamo	1	0	0	2	0	2	5
Dorado	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Guânica	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Guayama	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Guayanilla	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Guaynabo	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Gurabo	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Hatillo	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Hormigueros	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Humacao	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
Juncos	0	0	0	2	1	1	4
Lajas	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Lares	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Las Marías	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Las Piedras	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Loíza	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Luquillo	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Manatí	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Maricao	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Maunabo	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Mayaguez	1	1	2	1	1	4	10
Morovis	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
Naguabo	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Peñuelas	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

(Continued Table 13)

Municipalities	Residential Zones						
	Urban Slum Area	Urban Public Housing Project	Urban Residential Area	Other Urban Areas	Rural Land Granted Areas	Rural Others	Total
Ponce	8	4	8	0	1	0	21
Quebradillas	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Rincón	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Sabana Grande	0	0	2	2	1	0	5
Salinas	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
San Germán	0	0	0	1	0	6	7
San Juan	7	2	10	0	2	0	21
San Lorenzo	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
San Sebastián	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Santa Isabel	2	0	0	0	10	0	12
Toa Alta	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Toa Baja	0	0	5	0	2	0	7
Trujillo Alto	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Utuado	1	0	0	0	1	3	5
Vega Baja	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Villalba	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Yabucoa	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Yauco	2	0	2	0	0	0	4
TOTAL FREQUENCY	33	17	41	22	78	45	236
PERCENTAGE	14.0%	7.2%	17.4%	9.3%	33.0%	19.1%	100.0%

Table 14: Distribution of Sample by Specific Residential Zone at Place of Birth and Sex

Sex	Residential Zones																				
	Urban Slum Area			Public Housing Project			Urban Residential Area			Urban Others			Rural Gov. Granted Land			Rural Others			Total		
	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%
F-	10	8.7	39	1	.9	33	7	6.1	43	27	23.5	61	15	13.0	55	55	47.8	47	115	100	49
M-	16	13.4	61	2	1.7	67	9	7.6	57	17	14.3	39	12	10.1	45	63	10.1	53	119	100	51
Totals	26	11.1	100	3	1.3	100	16	6.8	100	44	18.8	100	27	11.5	100	118	50.4	100	234*	100	100

*Two persons could not be classified.

Table 15: Distribution of Sample by Actual Residential Zone and by Sex

Sex	Residential Zone																				
	Urban Slum Area			Public Housing Project			Urban Residential Area			Urban Others			Rural Gov. Granted Land			Rural Others			Total		
	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%	#	R%	K%
F-	11	9.5	33	10	8.6	59	22	19.0	53	14	12.1	63	36	31.0	47	23	19.8	51	116	100	49
M-	22	18.3	67	7	5.8	41	19	15.8	47	8	6.7	37	42	35.0	53	22	18.3	49	120	100	51
Totals	33	14.0	100	17	7.2	100	41	17.4	100	22	9.3	100	78	33.0	100	45	19.1	100	236	100	100

Table 16: Comparative Percentual Distribution of Present Specific Zone of Residence and Specific Zone of Birth

Residence	Residential Zones							
	Urban Slum	Public Housing	Urban Residential Area	Urban Others	Rural Land Granted	Rural Others	No Inf.	Total
Time of Birth	11.0	1.3	6.8	18.6	11.4	50.0	.9	100.0
Present Time	14.0	7.2	17.4	9.3	33.0	19.1	.0	100.0

Table 17: Movement from Rural to Urban Settings (Females)

	Bayamón	San Juan	Trujillo Alto	Ponce	Aibonito	Aguadilla	Total
Ciales	1						1
Guayanilla		1					1
Yabucoa			2				2
Luquillo		1					1
Guânica				1			1
Ponce					1	1	2
TOTAL	1	2	2	1	1	1	8

Table 18: Movement from Urban Areas to Rural Areas

	Salinas	Rincón	Villalba	Mayaguez	Gurabo	Total
San Juan	1		1		1	3
Mayaguez		2				2
Utuado				1		1
TOTAL	1	2	1	1	1	6

B. Migration Experience:

1. Traveling Experience:

In general, the 236 persons studied as return migrants to Puerto Rico have been traveling since 1918, making a total of 499 trips as of 1972. A listing of the trips by years shows a higher frequency of traveling after 1951, reaching a peak in 1968, and decreasing for 1971 and 1972.

Table 19: Number of Trips by Years

Year	Number of Trips Informed	Year	Number of Trips Informed
1918	1	1953	9
1920	1	1954	13
1925	2	1955	5
1928	1	1956	23
1930	1	1957	19
1932	1	1958	14
1939	3	1959	13
1940	1	1960	15
1942	1	1961	16
1943	3	1962	26
1944	4	1963	22
1945	4	1964	24
1946	2	1965	26
1947	2	1966	33
1948	2	1967	34
1949	3	1968	55
1950	4	1969	32
1951	11	1970	34
1952	12	1971	19
		1972	7
		not reported	1
			499

Although the 236 persons made a total of 499 trips, which provides an average of 2.1 trips per person, the fact is that the group's traveling experience ranged from one trip to a maximum of 13. As a matter of fact, 103 persons (43.6%) made only one trip. Therefore, 133 persons (56.4%) traveled to the U.S. two or more times. The average trips per person, for those migrants who had a repetition of travel as part of their migration experience, is of 3 trips.

A further break-down shows that 71 persons made three or more trips, thus averaging 3.5 trips per person. It should also be of interest to note that 8 persons made six or more trips to the U.S. during their migratory process.

Table 20: Distribution of Return Migrants by Number of Trips Made and by Sex

Number of Trips	Female		Male		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	54	46.55	49	40.83	103	43.64
2	36	31.03	26	21.67	62	26.27
3	16	13.79	21	17.50	37	15.68
4	5	4.31	14	11.67	19	8.05
5	2	1.72	5	4.17	7	2.97
6+	3	2.59	5	4.17	8	3.39
TOTAL	116	100.00	120	100.00	236	100.00

A comparison of the traveling experience of males and females shows that males tend to be more mobile than females. Even though the majority of both sexes, (56.4%) conducted two or more trips, more females than males are in the 1 and 2 trips categories, with a relative lesser participation in other categories. For instance, 54 females (46.5) vs. 49 (40.8%) males are in the one trip category, and 36 (31.0%) females vs. 26 (21.7%) males are in the 2 trip category. In other words, 77.6% of the females vs. 62.5% of the males travelled 2 times or less. From 3 trips or more the males are in higher proportion than females. 13.8% (16) females vs. 17.5% (21) males made three trips, 5 (4.3%) females vs. 14 (11.7%) males made 4 trips, 2 females (1.72) vs. 5 males (4.2%) made 5 trips and finally, 3 females (2.6%) vs. 5 males (4.2%) are in the category of 6 or more trips.

2. Places traveled to:

An analysis of the host communities for the Puerto Rican return migrants reveals that the largest proportion went to New York, both on the first trip (52.5%) as well as on their last trip (53.4%). A further analysis shows that 12.7% went to New Jersey on the first trip, and 13.1% on the last trip. Chicago was host to 5.1% and 5.9% of the return migrants on both the first and last trip. A total of 6.8% on the first time, and 5.9% on the last went to Connecticut. Boston received 1.7% on the first trip, and had an increase to 3.0%

on the last trip. There was a very light migration of hardly .9% to Miami, Florida on both the first and last trip. To conclude, the migration process was not restricted to the United States, nor to the States already mentioned.

Table 21: Distribution of Return Migrants to Place Traveled to on the First and Last Trip to the U. S.

	First Trip						Last Trip					
	Female		Male		Totals		Female		Male		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
New York	73	62.93	51	42.50	124	52.54	71	61.21	55	45.83	126	53.39
New Jersey	12	10.34	18	15.00	30	12.71	14	12.07	17	14.17	31	13.14
Miami	2	1.72	0	.00	2	.85	0	.00	2	1.67	2	.85
Connecticut	5	4.31	11	9.17	16	6.78	4	3.45	10	8.33	14	5.93
Boston	3	2.59	1	.83	4	1.69	6	5.17	1	.83	7	2.97
Chicago	5	4.31	7	5.83	12	5.08	6	5.17	8	6.67	14	5.93
Other Places U. S. A.	12	10.34	24	20.00	36	15.25	9	7.76	16	13.33	25	10.59
Other Places Outside U. S. A.	4	3.45	8	6.67	12	5.08	6	5.17	11	9.17	17	7.20
TOTAL	116	100.00	120	100.00	236	100.00	116	100.00	120	100.00	236	100.00

An analysis of the traveling dynamics by sex shows that considerably more females than males went to New York in both trips. There were 73 (62.9%) females and 51 (43%) males in the first trip, and 71 (61.2%) females and 55 (46%) males in the last.

Of the (30) 12.7% who went to New Jersey in the first trip, 12 were females and 18 were males (10.3% and 15% respectively). As to the last trip, 14 females (12.1%) and 17 males (14.2%) went to New Jersey. Connecticut was host to 5 females and 11 males (4.3% and 9.2%) in the frist trip, and 4 females and 10 males (3.5 and 8.3%) in the last. Of the 12 (5.1%) that went to Chicago the first time, 5 were females (4.3%) and 7 males (5.8%), and 6 females (5.2%) and 8 males (6.7%) for the last trip. To Boston, in the first trip, went 3 females and 1 male (2.6 and .83 per cent respectively). The amount of females increased in the last time to 6 (4.2%) and the males remain exactly the same.

3. Trainings Acquired:

Of the 236 return migrants, 47 (19.9%) have some kind of formal training on Technical, Vocational or Professional careers at the present time. Of those, there are 46 (97.9%) technical or vocational trainees, and only one (2.1%) professional. The analysis reveals that the great majority of the people (37) with specialized training were below 40 years of age, while the remaining 9 were 40 years old or over. Another fact is that only 3 persons (2 males and 1 female) below 20 years of age, had received any type of specialized training. Of the 47 persons with specialize training, 36 (76.6%) had been trained in Puerto Rico. The remaining 11 persons received their training in U. S. A. (9 - 19.1%) or outside the U. S. (2 - 4.3%).

In terms of sex distribution among those trained, there seems to be no difference between males and females, for 25 of the 47 persons are males. Those who received specialized training did it mainly through the Department of Education of Puerto Rico. Other training sources were the Department of Labor, private companies, Veteran Administration, Military Services, and correspondence courses programs. The most popular trainings were related to clerical skills and vocational programs such as sewing, practical nursing, auto and aircraft mechanics, cabinet making and handling of heavy equipment.

Of the total sample, 236, the remaining 189 persons had received their non-formal or non-specialized training while in Puerto Rico.

The succesful adaptation of culturally different people to a migration receptive society trascends the capabilities of these migrating people in terms of executing a particular job. As such, the knowledge of language becomes an extremely important vehicle to facilitate the development of social competence of the new arriving residents. However, that becomes a question which should be explored more thoroughly. To what extent is the receptive society eager to receive migrants who could develop social competence and substitute or compete with the older and established residents of the city, for the best job opportunities?

4. **English Language Proficiency before First Trip:**

Of the 236 migrants, 68 (29%) had command of the English language prior their first migratory experience. Of these, 36 (53%) were females and 32 (47%) were males. Of the 168 migrants who did not speak English, 88 (52%) were males and 80 (48%) females. It is obvious that the largest portion of migrants (2 out every 3) had no knowledge or domain of the English language prior their first trip. Furthermore, of those who did have some knowledge, women were slightly more fluent than males.

English Language Proficiency begore Last Trip:

Eventually, people exposed to a different language develop some kind of skills and knowledge of it. When analyzing this particular skill on the sample, we found that for the last trip, 106 (45%) of the sample knew some English while 29% had such skill on the first trip.

Of those 106 persons, there were slightly more females than males (54% to 46% respectively). Of the 130 migrants (55%) who did not speak any English, 71 (55%) were males and 59 (45%) were females.

Most of the migrants indicated having learned English informally through associations, job placement or other informal means such as T.V. or radio. One can deduce that this type of knowledge of the language

Table 22: Migrants' Knowledge of English Prior First and Last Migratory Experience to U.S.A. by Sex

	First Trip			Last Trip		
	Males	Females	Totals	Males	Females	Totals
Knowledge of English	32	36	68	49	57	106
No Knowledge of English	88	80	168	71	59	130
TOTAL	120	116	236	120	116	236

tends to be rather pragmatic, in the sense that it would facilitate a survival opportunity, but it is not precisely the adequate base for the development of successful social competence in a technological society which depends greatly on the attainment of specialized skills through formal education.

5. Job Experience of Migrants:

One of the question of extreme importance when analyzing migration movements is related to the occupational levels and activities of the migrants prior, during, and after the migratory experience. Our analysis reveals that only 75 subjects (33.5%) of the total sample (236) were working before their first trip. Half of the male cohort were working (50%) but only 16.4% of the females were on that same condition. Generally, there was an 8.5% (20 subjects) unemployment which was higher for males (14.2%) than for females

(2.6%). Most of the females were housekeepers (44%). Voluntary idleness was not a high frequence category, for it only included 4.7% of the sample. Students accounted for 22% of the total sample, which was higher for females (28.5%) than for males (15.8%). There was only one person (female) disabled and the vague category of "others" accounted for 9.3% of the total sample.

Analyzing the migrants in terms of the period immediately after returning from the first trip we find that levels of employment tended to drop significantly in both sexes. There was a level of employment equivalent to 25.4%,which in fact was higher for males than for females (37.5% among males and 12.9% among females).

Official unemployment rose to 18.6% (29.2% among males and 7.8% among females), and collecting unemployment -an absent category before migration- now accounts for 2.5% of all return migrants. Willful unemployment, or voluntary idleness, was more or less the same (6.4%). Housekeeping rose from 44% to 53.5% among females. Students dropped from 22% to 15.7%. There is one additional handicapped (male) and the "others" category dropped from 9.3% to 4.2%.

Apparently, the adjusting situation which the migrants experience in order to readapt to the Puerto Rican society, tends to level off and become somehow more favorable as the adapting period wears off.

At the present time (January - April/73), 41.5% of the total sample were employed. Both males and females rose in this category. Unemployment dropped to 9.8% which is about half of the same index at the time of reentry, but still slightly higher than prior to leaving. Collecting unemployment dropped to 1.7%, which is lower than the previous statistic. Voluntary idleness leveled off to the index prior to migrating (4.9%). Housekeeping rose to 60% among females, showing a constant rise. Students dropped even more, to 6.7%, and disabled persons rose to 3.4% (6 additional persons). The "others" category dropped to 2.5%.

The employment status of the return migrants show that, prior to the migratory experience there was an employment rate of 80%, with an unemployment rate of 20% among the total sample. At the time of reentry, the employment rate dropped to 55%, with a 45% unemployment. Presently, the employment rate is of 78%, with a 22% unemployment. Males have a higher employment rate as compared to females (58% vs. 20%). Although the employment rates are different for males and females, at all times it follows a consistent pattern. About one female is employed for every three males, thus providing an average female participation of 25% in the employed labor force.

Table 23: Distribution of Labor Force Status of Migrants Prior Migration, after Returning from First Trip and Present Status

P.R. before migration	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Employed	60	50.00	19	16.38	79	33.47
Unemployed	17	14.17	3	2.59	20	8.47
Collecting benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
Voluntary idled	8	6.67	3	2.59	11	4.66
Housekeeping	-	-	51	43.97	51	21.61
Student	19	15.83	33	28.45	52	22.03
Disabled	-	-	1	.86	1	.42
Others	16	13.33	6	5.17	22	9.32
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00
Immediately after return from first trip						
Employed	45	37.50	15	12.93	60	25.42
Unemployed	35	29.17	9	7.76	44	18.64
Collecting benefits	5	4.17	1	.86	6	2.54
Voluntary idled	13	10.83	2	1.72	15	6.36
Housekeeping	-	-	62	53.45	62	26.27
Student	14	11.67	23	19.83	37	15.68
Disabled	1	.83	1	.86	2	.85
Others	7	5.83	3	2.59	10	4.24
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00
Present Status						
Employed	72	60.00	26	22.41	98	41.53
Unemployed	18	15.00	5	4.31	23	9.75
Collecting benefits	4	3.33	-	-	4	1.69
Voluntary idled	8	6.67	3	2.59	11	4.66
Housekeeping	-	-	70	60.34	70	29.66
Student	7	5.83	9	7.76	16	6.70
Disabled	5	4.17	3	2.59	8	3.39
Others	6	5.00	-	-	6	2.54
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

6. Occupational Analysis:

The analysis of the sample by occupational categories reveals that the 236 return migrants are distributed as follows: 9 (3.8%) professionals or semi-professionals; 7 (3.0%) farmers or farm managers; 7 (3.0%) non-farm proprietors; 5 (2.1%) clerical or sales workers; 12 (5.1%) craftsmen or foremen; 21 (8.9%) operatives; 15 (6.4%) in service occupations; 11 (4.7%) farm laborers or farm foremen; 9 (3.8%) non-farm laborers; 3 (1.3%) did not specify, and 137 (58.1%) does not apply.

Obviously some occupational changes had taken place in the life history of this population. For instance, it should be noticed (Table 24) that there was only one (1) person working as a professional or semi-professional before the group left Puerto Rico on their first trip. At that same time, there was only one (1) Farmer or Farm Manager; five (5) non farm proprietors, managers or officials; four (4) clerical and sales workers, and 8 craftsmen or foremen. Altogether, there were 19 persons working on professional, managerial or skilled occupations before they left Puerto Rico in the first trip. There are 40 persons in those same categories at the present time. The occupational category which reveals the biggest change from one time period to another was the one of farm laborers. Out of 29 persons in this category before the first trip, we have only 11 at the present time. The reduction is equivalent to a 62% loss.

All the other occupational categories remain more or less the same, except the one most associated with a dependance status, that is the category of "does not apply." This category accounted for 65% of the people before the first trip, and accounts for 58% at the present time. The category in itself experienced a loss of 11%. Evidently, most of the new professionals or semi-professionals proceeded from this category - 7 out of 8.

Our interest in occupational mobility goes beyond the comparison of two time periods in the life experience of the return migrant sample. Our next analysis deals with the occupational category this people were placed in when they started working as migrants for the first time, and its relation to their previous occupational experience. We find that there is a higher level of occupational activity, thus a reduction in the "does not apply" category equivalent to 32%. On the first trip to the United States, there was no one on the professional or semi-professional category, as well as in the farmers or farm managers category. There were eight non-farm proprietors, two of which fell on the same category in Puerto Rico before the first trip. Two were on clerical and sales occupations, five as craftsmen or foremen, 55 as operatives, 19 in services occupations, 28 as farm laborers or foremen, 6 as non-farm laborers and 8 who did not specify their particular occupations. The most significant shift is observed in two categories: one which has already been mentioned, "does not apply category"; the other which is that of operatives (Table 25). There were only 19 operatives in the group in Puerto Rico before the first trip. The category rose to 55 in the U. S. during the first trip. There is an increase of 36 persons or a 189% increase in the category. Our interpretation, and this as a result of the fact 27 out of the new 36 persons in the category proceeded from the "does not apply category", is that apparently there was a higher demand on women skills that forced this family member into the job market.

The dynamics of occupational mobility are extremely important for a society with such a high level of change as Puerto Rico. For instance, of the original 8 non-farm proprietors in the U.S. - First Trip, one became an operative, and seven dropped out into the "does not apply category". Nevertheless, there are 3 new non-farm proprietors during the last trip to the U. S. These people proceeded from the "does not apply" category. Clerical and sales workers gained one extra member in the period (3); craftsmen or foremen did the same and went to 7 members; operatives decreased to 36, which is a loss of 34.5%. Services employees decreased 5 members (26%); farm laborers were reduced by 43% (12 members); and the category for non-farm laborers disappeared. However, there was a significant increase in the "does not apply category." This category went from 104 members during the first trip to U. S., to 152 members during the last trip to the U. S. The increase is equivalent to 46%. Again we are moved to provide another interpretation consistent with the previous one, specially when the "operatives" category accounts for 30 of the 48 new members in the "does not apply" category. It is our impression that the entry process into a new society forces the utilization of all available resources simply in order to subsist. Once certain adaptations have occurred, the normalizing process starts taking place, that is, a return to traditional ways and system. (Table 26.)

To complete the occupational cycle in the life history of this group, we have to study the relation of their last occupation in the United States, with their present situation in Puerto Rico. The analysis of this data (Table 27) reveals that the 9 persons on professional or semi-professional occupations in Puerto Rico at the present time were in different categories in the United States on their last trip. For instance, there was one (1) working as a non-farm proprietor and eight (8) in the "does not apply" category. The seven (7) farmers or farm managers had U. S. occupations as follows: 1 as craftsman or foreman; 3 in services; 3 in the "does not apply" category. The 7 non farm proprietors proceeded mainly from the "does not apply" category (5), one who was an operative, and one who was a farm laborer. None of the people who were non-farm proprietors in the last trip to U. S., were on the same occupational category in Puerto Rico as of their last return. The same is true for the three persons in clerical and sales work in the U. S. One of those is working in a service occupation in Puerto Rico, and the other two are in the "does not apply" category. The five persons in that category in Puerto Rico at the present time proceed from operatives (1), farm laborers (1), and "does not apply" (3). Two of the seven craftsmen or foremen in the United States-last trip, are working as craftsmen or foremen in Puerto Rico at the present time. The other five persons are located as follows: 1 as farmer or farm manager, and four in the "does not apply" category. Of the 12 craftsmen or foremen in Puerto Rico, two were on that same category in U.S., five worked as operatives, one in services, three as farm laborers and one was in the "does not apply" category. Only 7 of the 36 operatives in U. S., are working as operatives in Puerto Rico. The remaining 29 operatives in the U. S. are distributed in Puerto Rico as follows: 1 as a non-farm proprietor; 1 in clerical and sales; 5 as craftsmen or foremen; 1 in services; 2 as farm laborers and 19 in the "does not apply" category. In addition to the seven operatives already mentioned, there are fourteen persons working in that same occupational category in Puerto Rico at the present time. Of those, two proceeded from the non-farm proprietor sector, and 12 from the "does not apply" category. Only three of the people working in service occupations were also in that same category in their last trip to the U. S. The highest majority (7) proceeded from the "does not apply" category. Almost half (6) of the people working in service occupations their last time in the U. S. are non classified in the "does not apply" category in Puerto Rico. Of the sixteen (16) farm laborers in the U. S., 3 have become craftsmen or foremen in Puerto Rico, 2 are working in service occupations, 3 are still employed as farm laborers, 4 have become non-farm laborers and only 2 are classified in the "does not apply" category. The 9 persons working as non-farm laborers in Puerto Rico at the present time proceeded from various categories in U. S., such as farm laborers (4), "does not apply" (4), and one (1) who was on service occupation. It is interesting to note that 100 of the 152 persons classified in the "does not apply" category while in their last trip in the United States have maintained that same status on their return to Puerto Rico.

Evidently, the analysis of occupational mobility provides a rather comprehensive picture of the migration process which had been absent in previous reports. For instance, we found that the level of actual occupational placement in Puerto Rico before traveling to the United States is of 34.7% for the whole sample. Once in the United States, this index rises to 52.5%, which definitely implies an extended recruitment of available resource by the host labor market. Nevertheless, the ranking of occupations in the United States is much lower than in Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico, there were some professionals and/or semi-professionals, farmers or farm managers, skilled workers such as clerical and sales workers, as well as craftsmen, while very few or none were employed in these same categories on the first migration experience in United States. In fact, at no time throughout the whole migration process are there any Puerto Ricans employed as professionals, semi-professionals, farmers or farm managers while in the United States. Nevertheless, one must also say that the occupational distribution of the return migrants at the present time differs significantly from their occupational distribution before traveling. Table 19 shows that there was only one professional or semi-professional before traveling, there are nine (9) at the present time; while there was only one farmer or farm manager, there are 7 now; non-farm proprietors move from 5 to seven; clerical and sales workers move from 4 to 5, and craftsmen and foremen, which were only 8 before first trip, are 12 at the present time. More significant, the low unskilled occupations, such as farm workers dropped from 29 before the first trip to 11 at the present time. The changes observed are clear indications of a group tendency toward upward mobility on the occupational ladder. Nevertheless, we cannot establish whether those changes are strictly due to the migration experience or to any other specific factor. Some of them which should be explored more thoroughly are education, special trainings, language proficiency and age. We should consider that many of the new members in the occupations described proceed, precisely, from that category which is not involved directly in the labor force, that is the "does not apply" category. That should be reason enough to think that the mobility observed could be related to these other variables and not necessarily to occupational skills acquired during the migration experience.

Table 24: Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico Before First Trip with Present Occupational Categories

Present Occupational Categories

Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico before first trip	Total		Prof. & Semi-Prof.		Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		Non- Labo
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Totals	236	100.0	9	3.8	7	3.0	7	3.0	5	2.1	12	5.1	21	8.9	15	6.4	11	4.7	9
Prof. and Semi-Prof.	1	.42	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Farmers or Farm Managers	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-farm prop. manag. or offic.	5	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-
Clerical and Sales	4	1.7	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Craftsmen or foremen	8	3.4									2	.85	1	.42					
Operatives	19	8.1	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	3	1.3	5	2.1	1	.42	-	-	-
Services	7	3.0	-	-	2	.85	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	1
Farm Laborer & Farm Foremen	29	12.3	-	-	-	-	1	.42	1	.42	5	2.1	1	.42	3	1.3	5	2.1	4
Non farm laborers	8	3.4	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	1
Not specified	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Does not apply	154	65.3	7	3.0	3	1.3	5	2.1	2	.85	1	.42	12	5.1	9	3.8	6	2.5	3

24: Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico Before First Trip with Present Occupational Categories

Present Occupational Categories

rof. & mi-Prof.		Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		Non-farm Laborers		Not specified		Does not apply	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
9	3.8	7	3.0	7	3.0	5	2.1	12	5.1	21	8.9	15	6.4	11	4.7	9	3.8	3	1.3	137	58.1
1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.7
-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85
								2	.85	1	.42									5	2.1
-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	3	1.3	5	2.1	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	3.8
-	-	2	.85	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42
-	-	-	-	1	.42	1	.42	5	2.1	1	.42	3	1.3	5	2.1	4	1.7	-	-	9	3.8
	.42	-	-	1	.42	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	3	1.3
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3.0	3	1.3	5	2.1	2	.85	1	.42	12	5.1	9	3.8	6	2.5	3	1.3	3	1.3	103	43.6

Table 25: Comparison of Migrants in Terms or Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico Before First Trip with Occupations in U.S. First Trip

Occuppation in U.S. First Trip

Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico before first trip	Total		Prof. & Semi-Prof.		Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		No La
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Totals	236	100.0	-	-	-	-	8	3.4	2	.85	6	2.5	55	23.3	19	8.1	28	11.9	6
Prof. and Semi-Prof.	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Farmers or Farm Managers	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-farm prop. manag. or offic.	5	2.1	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-
Clerical and Sales	4	1.7	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-
Craftsmen or foremen	8	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.7	-	-	1	.42	-
Operatives	19	8.1	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	12	5.1	2	.85	-	-	-
Services	7	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	-	-	2
Farm Laborer & Farm Foremen	29	12.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2.1	6	2.5	14	6.0	2
Non-farm laborers	8	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	3	1.3	-
Not specified	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Does not apply	154	65.3	-	-	-	-	4	1.7	2	.85	3	1.3	27	11.4	9	3.8	9	3.8	2

Comparison of Migrants in Terms or Occupational Categories in Puerto Rico Before First Trip with Occupations in U.S. First Trip

Occuppation in U.S. First Trip

& Prof.	Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		Non-farm Laborers		Not specified		Does not apply	
%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
-	-	-	8	3.4	2	.85	6	2.5	55	23.3	19	8.1	28	11.9	6	2.5	8	3.4	104	44.1
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-
-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.7	-	-	1	.42	-	-	2	.85	1	.42
-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	12	5.1	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.3
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	-	-	2	.85	-	-	2	.85
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2.1	6	2.5	14	6.0	2	.85	-	-	2	.85
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	-	-	2	.85
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	4	1.7	2	.85	3	1.3	27	11.4	9	3.8	9	3.8	2	.85	5	2.1	93	39.4

Table 26: Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in U.S. First Time with Occupations in U.S. Last Time

Occupations in U.S. Last Time

Occupations U. S. First Time	Total		Prof. & Semi-Prof.		Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-Farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		Non Lab
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Totals	236	100.0	-	-	-	-	3	1.3	3	1.3	7	3.0	36	15.3	14	6.0	16	7.0	-
Prof. and Semi-Prof.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Farmers or Farm Managers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-farm prop. manag. or offic.	8	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-
Clerical and Sales	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Craftsmen or foremen	6	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-
Operatives	55	23.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	17	7.20	2	.85	2	.85	-
Services	19	8.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	6	2.5	-	-	-
Farm Laborer & Farm Foremen	28	11.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	14	6.0	-
Non-farm laborers	6	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not specified	8	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-
Does not apply	104	44.1	-	-	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	3	1.3	15	6.40	4	1.7	-	-	-

Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in U.S. First Time with Occupations in U.S. Last Time

Occupations in U.S. Last Time

& rof.	Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-Farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		Non-Farm Laborers		Not specified		Does not apply	
%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
-	-	-	3	1.3	3	1.3	7	3.0	36	15.3	14	6.0	16	7.0	-	-	5	2.1	152	64.4
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	3.0
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.3
-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	17	7.20	2	.85	2	.85	-	-	1	.42	30	13.0
-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	6	2.5	-	-	-	-	1	.42	11	4.7
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	1	.42	14	6.0	-	-	-	-	11	4.7
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	5	2.1
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	2	.85	4	1.7
-	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	3	1.3	15	6.40	4	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	79	33.5

Table 27: Comparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in Present Occupations in Puerto Rico with Occupations in U.S. Last Time

Present Occupations in Puerto Rico

Occupations U. S. Last Time	Total		Prof. & Semi-Prof.		Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-Farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		Non- Labo
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Totals	236	100.0	9	3.8	7	3.0	7	3.0	5	2.1	12	5.1	21	8.9	15	6.4	11	4.7	9
Prof. and Semi-Prof.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Farmers or Farm Managers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-farm prop. manag. or offic.	3	1.3	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-
Clerical and Sales	3	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-
Craftsmen or foremen	7	3.0	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operatives	36	15.3	-	-	-	-	1	.42	1	.42	5	2.1	7	3.0	1	.42	2	.85	-
Services	14	6.0	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	1
Farm Laborer & Farm Foremen	16	7.0	-	-	-	-	1	.42	1	.42	3	1.3	-	-	2	.85	3	1.3	4
Non-farm laborers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not specified	5	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-
Does not apply	152	64.4	8	3.4	3	1.3	5	2.1	3	1.3	1	.42	12	5.1	7	3.0	6	2.5	4

mparison of Migrants in Terms of Occupational Categories in Present
cupations in Puerto Rico with Occupations in U.S. Last Time

Present Occupations in Puerto Rico

Farmers or Farm Managers		Non-Farm Proprietor		Clerical & Sales		Craftsmen or foremen		Operatives		Services		Farm Laborers Foremen		Non-farm Laborers		Not specified		Does not apply	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
7	3.0	7	3.0	5	2.1	12	5.1	21	8.9	15	6.4	11	4.7	9	3.8	3	1.3	137	58.1
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.85
1	.42	-	-	-	-	2	.85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.7
-	-	1	.42	1	.42	5	2.1	7	3.0	1	.42	2	.85	-	-	-	-	19	8.1
3	1.3	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	3	1.3	-	-	1	.42	-	-	6	2.5
-	-	1	.42	1	.42	3	1.3	-	-	2	.85	3	1.3	4	1.7	-	-	2	.85
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.7
3	1.3	5	2.1	3	1.3	1	.42	12	5.1	7	3.0	6	2.5	4	1.7	3	1.3	100	42.4

7. Income Analysis:

In order to do a comparative income analysis on the data we obtained, it was necessary to adjust the monthly salary that the people had received and convert it into a real income distribution. This process was done using the real income index established for the United States. The application of this index allows for the adjustment of the nominal or earned salary according to the real value of the dollar for each specific year. In this way a comparison accross years can be performed.

Our analysis indicates that there has been a definite increase in the median monthly salary of the Return Migrants throughout the different stages of the migration process. For instance, the median monthly income for the Return Migrants before they left Puerto Rico the first time was of $158.20, with males perceiving a higher income than females. Upon return from the first trip, the median income rose to $202.20 per month, thus an increase of 27.8% on real income.

Although, as we had indicated, there were less people working immediately after return, precisely because a process of readaptation is taking place, it seems that the return migrants have a higher income at this particular time. Furthermore, as they become immersed in the Puerto Rican system, there is a tendency toward leveling off. By the time they are ready to depart on their last trip, their median income has decreased to $176.60 per month, which is equivalent to a 12.7% loss in salary. In this process males kept a much higher income than females. A similar trend is observed after the migrants returned from the last trip. The median monthly income increase to $231.50, which represents an increase of 31.1% over the previous stage while in Puerto Rico. However, a drastic decrease, as was observed on the first occasion, has not yet occured, for the present median income is of $228.90 per month. Nevertheless this income is slightly lower than the income the group was receiving immediately upon return. However, we have to recall that this sample included Return Migrants from 1965 to 1972, which is a very recent period. Perhaps in due time the same process of leveling off can be observed.

Evidently there is a significant difference between the monthly income received by the migrants while in Puerto Rico, and the monthly income received in the United States. The median monthly income received on the first trip was of $263.00, which represent a 66.2% increase in salary from the income in Puerto Rico. Again, in the last trip, the median income was of $270.50 per month, which is a 53.2% increase over their monthly salary in Puerto Rico. Obviously, the reality of differential income, or the perception of such differences, without taking into consideration other factors, may be one of the variables influencing the high level of migration which we have experienced in Puerto Rico. See tables 28 to 35 for all details related to income.

Table 28: Distribution of Adjusted Median Income per Month* for the Puerto Rican Return Migrants at Different Stages of the Migration Process

	Puerto Rico			United States		
	Males	Females	Totals	Males	Females	Totals
Before First Trip	163.8	150.5	158.2			
First Trip				273.2	250.5	263.0
Return First Trip	196.3	215.5	202.2			
Before Last Trip	164.4	220.5	176.6			
Last Trip				276.6	258.8	270.5
Return Last Trip	225.5	241.4	231.5			
Present Income	224.6	237.3	228.9			

---

* Real income is tabulated in terms of U.S. Dollars.

Table 29: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex Before First Trip to U.S.

Adjusted Real Income	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
- 50	3	2.50	2	1.72	5	2.12
51 - 100	12	10.00	2	1.72	14	5.93
101 - 200	15	12.50	11	9.48	26	11.02
201 - 300	16	13.33	4	3.45	20	8.47
301 - 400	2	1.67	0	.00	2	.85
+ 400	1	.83	0	.00	1	.42
No income reported	71	59.17	97	83.62	168	71.19
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

Table 30: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex During First Trip to U.S.

Adjusted Real Income	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
- 50	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
51 - 100	2	1.67	0	.00	2	.85
101 - 200	13	10.83	7	6.03	20	8.47
201 - 300	33	27.50	27	23.28	60	25.42
301 - 400	18	15.00	5	4.31	23	9.75
+ 400	12	10.00	2	1.72	14	5.93
No income reported	42	35.00	75	64.66	117	49.58
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

Table 31: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex after Returning From First Trip to U.S.

Adjusted Real Income	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
- 50	0	.00	1	.86	1	.42
51 - 100	6	5.00	0	.00	6	2.54
101 - 200	24	20.00	6	5.17	30	12.71
201 - 300	20	16.67	10	8.62	30	12.71
301 - 400	5	4.17	0	.00	5	2.12
+ 400	3	2.50	0	.00	3	1.27
No income reported	62	51.67	99	85.34	161	68.22
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

Table 32: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex Before Last Trip to U.S.

Adjusted Real Income	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
- 50	2	1.67	0	.00	2	.85
51 - 100	5	4.17	0	.00	5	2.12
101 - 200	18	15.00	5	4.31	23	9.75
201 - 300	8	6.67	5	4.31	13	5.51
301 - 400	2	1.67	0	.00	2	.85
+ 400	2	1.67	2	1.72	4	1.69
No income reported	83	69.17	104	89.66	187	79.24
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

Table 33: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex During Last Trip to U.S.

Adjusted Real Income	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
- 50	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
51 - 100	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
101 - 200	10	8.33	6	5.17	16	6.78
201 - 300	23	19.17	12	10.34	35	14.83
301 - 400	16	13.33	7	6.03	23	9.75
+ 400	6	5.00	1	.86	7	2.97
No income reported	65	54.17	90	77.59	155	65.68
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

Table 34: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex After Returning from Last Trip to U.S.

Adjusted Real Income	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
- 50	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
51 - 100	3	2.50	1	.86	4	1.69
101 - 200	17	14.17	3	2.59	20	8.47
201 - 300	18	15.00	11	9.48	29	12.29
301 - 400	6	5.00	0	.00	6	2.54
+ 400	5	4.17	2	1.72	7	2.97
No income reported	71	59.17	99	85.34	170	72.03
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

Table 35: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Adjusted Real Income per Month and by Sex at Time of Interview: 1973

Adjusted Real Income	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
- 50	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
51 - 100	8	6.67	1	.86	9	3.81
101 - 200	23	19.17	6	5.17	29	12.29
201 - 300	29	24.17	15	12.93	44	18.64
301 - 400	6	5.00	1	.86	7	2.97
+ 400	10	8.33	2	1.72	12	5.08
No income reported	44	36.67	91	78.45	135	57.20
Total	120	100.00	116	100.00	236	100.00

C. Analysis of Motivational Factors on Migration:

1. Motivations to Migrate:

After analyzing some of the most relevant demographic variables, as well as data relevant to migration experience, we are still intrigued by the questions: What factors have motivated Puerto Rican migrants to leave their country and engage in process of constant traveling to the U. S. with an eventual return to Puerto Rico?

An exploration into attitudes should provide us with some insights of this phenomenon.

The motivations to migrate are diverse and stratified, as expressed by the sample of return migrants. The main reasons were: (1) Personal; (2) Economic; (3) Educational;

(4) Environmental; (5) Others. The "Personal" category is subdivided into 5 subcategories, which are: (a) health problems; (b) family sent for them; (c) children were studying; (d) other family problems; and (e) military requirements.

The data analysis reveals different motivations among men from women as well as different responses among the various categories. For instance, 109 of the interviewees (46%) claimed personal reasons as motivations to migrate on the first occasion. However, of those 109 persons, 74 (68%) were females, which in fact constitute a 64% of the female cohort. The remaining thirty-five (35) persons were males, whose highest motivational category was not personal, but rather economic. Males classified 29% of its population in the "personal category" reason for migrating.

A breakdown of the personal category shows that the highest amount of females who migrated the first time, did so because of "family problems" (37 women or 50% of the category total). A second subcategory, in the case of females, was that the "family sent for them", which amounted to 22 women, or 30% of its cohort in that category. In relation to men, the highest subcategory was "military requirements", which accounted for 14 persons (or 40% of the men in that category). Family problems was a second high subcategory, accounting for 11 (or 31%) of the 35 males.

The second highest motivational category for migrating the first time was Economic Reasons. A total of 69 persons (29%) were classified in this category. Men, as we have mentioned, were responsible for 80% (55) of the total population in that category. Economic Reasons was the highest motivational category for all men (46% of the total), while personal reasons was highest for females (74 or 64% of the total) on the first migration trip. Economic reasons was third highest for females (12%), while personal reasons was second highest for males (29%).

In addition, 10 persons, 7 males (5.8%) and 3 females (2.6%) claimed educational motivations as their reason for migrating the first time. Another 13 persons (5.5%), consisting 6 males (5%) and 7 females (6%), indicated that environmental conditions were their reason for leaving Puerto Rico for the first time.

Evidently, the exposure to the migration process may generate new attitudes, or even help to modify old ones. This is observed in the reasons given by the sample of return migrants for migrating their last time. Personal reasons, as a moving factor, decreased to a 38% of the total sample. Although it was still the highest mentioned category, it was much closer to economic reasons (35% of the total sample) than on the first occasion. Furthermore, even though women predominated in terms of personal reasons, they did experience a drop from 74 females to 67 females in relation to the first and last trip. A parallel rise was observed in terms of economic reasons (12% to 15%) among females. Similar to the first occasion, family conditions were related to women's personal reasons for migrating.

Economic reasons was the most important motivational factor for the male cohort, experiencing a significant increase of 22% on the last trip in relation to the first trip. In addition, the 67 males who claimed economic reasons for migration in the last trip constitute 56% of the male cohort.

There was no significant change in terms of educational, environmental or other categories from the first to the last trip. See tables 36 and 37 for more details.

Table 36: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Reasons for Leaving Puerto Rico in the First Trip by Sex

Reasons	First Trip					
	Males		Females		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Personal	35	29.2	74	63.8	109	46.2
a. Health problems	3	2.5	9	7.8	12	5.1
b. Family sent for them	6	5.0	22	19.0	28	11.9
c. Children studying	1	.8	2	1.7	3	1.3
d. Family problems	11	9.2	37	31.9	48	20.3
e. Military requirements	14	11.7	4	3.4	18	7.6
2. Economic	55	45.8	14	12.1	69	29.2
3. Educational	7	5.8	3	2.6	10	4.2
4. Environmental	6	5.0	7	6.0	13	5.5
5. Others	17	14.2	18	15.5	35	14.8
6. No information	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	120	100.0	116	100.0	236	100.0

Table 37: Distribution of Return Migrants in Terms of Reasons for Leaving Puerto Rico in the Last Trip by Sex

Reasons	Last Trip					
	Males		Females		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Personal	24	20.0	67	57.8	91	38.6
a. Health problems	2	1.7	9	7.8	11	4.7
b. Family sent for them	5	4.2	21	18.1	26	11.0
c. Children studying	1	.8	-	-	1	.4
d. Family problems	8	6.7	34	29.3	42	17.8
e. Military requirements	8	6.7	3	2.6	11	4.7
2. Economic	67	55.8	17	14.7	84	35.6
3. Educational	7	5.8	4	3.4	11	4.7
4. Environmental	3	2.5	5	4.3	8	3.4
5. Others	13	10.8	21	18.1	34	14.4
6. No information	6	5.0	2	1.7	8	3.4
Total	120	100.0	116	100.0	236	100.0

2. Motivations to Return:

Returning to Puerto Rico, both after the first and last trip responded to a variety of reasons. Personal reasons ranked first as a return motivation, both on the first and the last trip. In fact 70.3% of all returnees indicated that they had personal reasons for returning on the first occasion, and 63.6% on the last. However, personal reasons as a motivational factor were much higher among females than among males. This particular category is subdivided into six specific subcategories which are: health problems; family sent for them; death or other problems in family; homesickness; to place children in Puerto Rican schools; and other personal reasons. It is significant to observe that 47 persons (18 males and 29 females) out of the 166 who returned due to personal reasons after the first trip, did so because of health problems. This subcategory constitutes a 28.3% of the total category. Similarly, after the last trip, and on the same "Personal" category, 51 persons (or 34%) returned because of health problems. The strength of cultural bonds, as manifested in nostalgic and/or emotional feelings, should be noticed as influencing a return migration process to Puerto Rico. If we consider family ties, homesickness and preferences for Puerto Rican institutions as a group, then one out of every three return migrants is thus categorized. As a matter of fact, 34% of the total sample for the first trip and 30.1% for the last trip were classified within those subcategories that showed the strength of the Puerto Rican culture in influencing a return trip.

Economic reasons, as motivational factors for return, ranked second. In both occasions, first and last trip, an average of 14% were classified in this particular category. Furthermore, it was a higher ranked motivation for males than for females.

An additional analysis of the reasons for returning shows that approximately 40% of the return migrants expressed concern with their physical well being while in the United States, as an important factor in order to return to Puerto Rico. For instance, if we group together health problems, other personal reasons, and environmental conditions, we have 42.3% of the population categorized in this compossed category for the first return, and 41.1% on the last return. One further observation shows that environmental reasons, which does not excluded social-psychological environmental, rose from 5.5% on the first occasion to 8.8% for the last return.

Our interpretation of these factors, as related to relative strength of the Puerto Rican culture, is that we have a population subjected to external forces which atract and reject the migrants at both sides of the migration stream at the same time.

Obviously, this trend could result for some migrants in a constant process of social deprivation, enhanced by a feeling of prejudice, risk, and social alienation. See tables 38 and 39 for further details.

Table 38: Distribution of Return Migrants by Reasons Given to Return to Puerto Rico After the First Trip, by Sex

	After First Trip					
Reasons	Males		Females		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Personal	77	64.2	89	76.7	166	70.3
a. Health problems	18	15.0	29	25.0	47	19.9
b. Family sent for them	9	7.5	7	6.0	16	6.8
c. Death or other problems in family	15	12.5	23	19.8	38	16.1
d. Homesickness	7	5.8	13	11.2	20	8.5
e. To place children in Puerto Rican schools	1	.8	1	.9	2	.8
f. Other personal reasons	27	22.5	16	13.8	43	18.2
2. Economic	23	19.2	11	9.5	34	14.4
3. Educational	-	-	3	2.6	3	1.3
4. Environmental	8	6.7	5	4.3	13	5.5
5. Various Reasons	8	6.7	4	3.4	12	5.1
6. Others	3	2.5	3	2.6	6	2.5
7. No information	1	.8	1	.9	2	.8
Totals	120	100.0	116	100.0	236	100.0

Table 39: Distribution of Return Migrants by Reasons Given to Return to Puerto Rico After the Last Trip, by Sex

Reasons	After Last Trip					
	Males		Females		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Personal	70	58.3	80	69.0	150	63.6
a. Health problems	22	18.3	29	25.0	51	21.6
b. Family sent for them	14	11.7	27	23.3	41	17.4
c. Death or other problems in family	3	2.5	2	1.7	5	2.1
d. Homesickness	10	8.3	15	12.9	25	10.6
e. To place children in Puerto Rican schools	1	.8	-	-	1	.4
f. Other personal reasons	20	16.7	7	6.0	27	11.4
2. Economic	22	18.3	13	11.2	35	14.8
3. Educational	3	2.5	3	2.6	6	2.5
4. Environmental	12	10.0	7	6.0	19	8.1
5. Various Reasons	9	7.5	4	3.4	13	5.5
6. Others	3	2.5	1	.9	4	1.7
7. No information	1	.8	8	6.9	9	3.8
Totals	120	100.0	116	100.0	236	100.0

II. Summary:

The Return Migrant's analysis revealed that out, of 236 subjects, 120 were males and 116 females. They ranged from 14 to over 65 years old, with a median age of 32 years. A high representation of people 45 years old or over (27.2%) was observed. Furthermore, 18.6% of the sample were functional illiterate. Only 3% had studied beyond the High School level. However, 33.9%, had completed a High School education. Additionally, 20% of the sample had some kind of Technical, vocational or professional training. Most of the subjects in the sample, (58.9%) were married. Almost half (48.3%) of the return migrants were household heads in household units that ranged from 1 to 9 members, with an average family size of 3.5 members.

The 236 return migrants were born in 55 of the 77 Island towns. A very significant proportion of them (38.6%) migrated from small towns of 25,000 people or less. Only 8.9% of the migrants proceeded from large size (200,000 plus persons) municipalities. Sixty one (61.4%) proceeded from rural zones, and 38.6% from urban areas. The municipalities located in the center of the Island were tagged with a much heavier rural migration rate (3.5 rural vs 1 urban) than the rest of the Island (2 rural per 1 urban).

A very high proportion of the return migrants (83.9%) established themselves in the same municipalities from where they came from, but on urban zones.

The return migrants had been traveling since 1918, making a total of 499 trips among them. In fact, they ranged from one to thirteen trips. Over half of the sample (56.4%) had made two or more trips.

Those migrants with a history of repeated migration had an average of 3 trips per person. Most of the traveling was done to New York (53%), but New Jersey, Connecticut, Chicago and Boston were also host communities to the Puerto Rican migrants. This variety of traveling routes happened, even though only 29% of the migrants had English language proficiency, before the first time they traveled. A considerable proportion of the migrants acquired language skills during their experience in the United States, thus facilitating their adaptation in the subsequent trips. English language was learned basically through informal methods, such as social gatherings, job settings, television, radio, etc.

Evidently, working opportunities in Puerto Rico were kind of limited at the time prior to the migrants' first departure. About (75 persons) 33.5% of the whole sample were holding jobs in Puerto Rico, earning a median monthly salary of $158.20. During the first trip to the United States, 132 persons (or 55.9%) of the same sample were employed, with a monthly median income of $263.00, which represents a 66.2% increase over the income in Puerto Rico. During the last trip to the United States, 35.6% were holding jobs, with a median salary of $270.50

per month. This salary bracket was much higher (53.2% increase) than the salary received in Puerto Rico prior to their last trip. At the present time in Puerto Rico, 42% of the sample are employed, earning a monthly median salary of $228.90 (which is 15.4% lower than the salary in United States).

The motivations for migrating have to be analyzed in terms of males and females. Males migrated more than females for economic reasons, both on the first and last trip. Females were moved by personal motives, which included family ties, health problems and placing children in school. The process of returning to Puerto Rico was highly influenced, both in males and females, by the strength of familistic ties, and by the dynamics of negative and positive forces operating at the same time.

III. Implications:

The study of migration and therefore, the study of return migration, requires a redefinition of the concept as to allow for a more objective and reliable perspective. We can no longer talk about migration as a one-way process, nor of the migrants as a homogeneous marginalized group. In fact we have at least four different variations of the concept, which are:

1. Those who migrate and become assimilated to the host community, thus developing new ties and competence, even a new identify.
2. Those who migrate and, although they may be successful, return to their place of origin and reinforce their cultural values and ties, thus at the same time reinforcing a conceptual construction of migration as a temporary experience. They may even complement their value reinforcement by acquiring land, houses, or other properties, which function as bridges to maintain a cultural identify.
3. Those who migrate, do not become assimilated or relatively successful, and soon return to Puerto Rico to never migrate again.
4. Those who migrate, reconstruct a Puerto Rican social, and perhaps even physical environment, in the place where they migrated to.

The social and physical reconstruction of environment may influence a stronger need for a Puerto Rican identity. Thus they tend to return to Puerto Rico as often as they can, but however, their social construction abroad requires their return. Eventually they may spend a whole life traveling back and forth without solving the dilemma of being Puerto Rican or being from Puerto Rico. And even more disruptive, in the process, they may become alienated from both social systems, and at the same time subjected to requirements and expectations of both. Professor José A. Torres Zayas, illustrates this process beautifully and very significantly in his article, "The Puerto Rican in New York: A Case-Study of Psycho-Sociological Alienation" 4/ part of which we quote:

> Goya is not a typical emigrant. My own observations of the Puerto Rican emigrants in New York or Chicago do not correspond to Goya's reported behavior. The typical emigrants, in the first place, would have gone to live in a community-like neighbourhood where they would be surrounded by emigrants coming, like them, from Puerto Rico or, probably, from the same town. There would always be a person at hand with whom to share even tears. Another pattern commonly observed in the Puerto Rican "colony" of emigrants is that some time after their being settled, they will send for other members of their family —usually the next brother or sister.
>
> At any rate, there is good reason to believe that Goya's argument for using contraceptives is a flagrant rationalisation of her inner feelings. It would "be a disaster", she says, if she would become pregnant. (She uses the same word, "disaster", when describing her family's misery in Hato). What is the real content of this "disaster" to her? She would have to face the crude and natural reality that she is a woman, and as such, biologically created to procreate. The sex-status definition and expectancies of her community are also violated. Her use of contraceptives is her ultimate negation of the self.

> This then, is her present condition. Life has no meaning or purpose for her, except "giving it" at work. She experiences herself as an alien. She has become, one might say, estranged from herself. She finds herself seized and caught half way between Hato and New York. Each place represents conflict. In between there is an ocean. She is alienated from her culture, her community, her family and worst of all, from herself. That is her condition of moral aloneness.

Michael Piore,[5] in his study related to Puerto Rican migrants to the Boston area, indicates:

> "Migration of Puerto Ricans to the mainland performs important economic functions for the mainland economy, functions which appear to benefit continental americans, and argueably at least, the migrants themselves.
>
> "The impact of the migration, however, also imposes certain costs, upon the migrants, upon their children who grow up in a netherland between two cultures, and possibly, upon the Puerto Rican economy.
>
> "My own contact with the phenomenon suggests that, for labor market analysis, at least, one should distinguish three distinct migration streams. The seasonal agricultural migration should be distinguished from the urban-industrial migration, and, within the latter, a distinction should be made between two different migratory processes which I am tempted to call temporary and permanent but which may just as well be labeled new and old migration."

Although we feel that the concept of migration has to be dealt with more rigorously than what Piore suggests, his paper call the attention to all people concerned with this phenomenon. That is, he suggests an urgent need to develop a thorough research on the implications of the migration status to the Puerto Rican labor force, both in the United States as well as in Puerto Rico. Our question is: To what extent are Puerto Ricans still affected by the social stigma of the migrant status, when seeking job opportunities, both in the United States and upon return to Puerto Rico?

Robert Taggart, in his paper "The Socioeconomic Status of Puerto Ricans in New York City Poverty Areas"[6] is very consistent with our own preoccupations, as well as with some of our findings, specially those related to the occupational distribution of the returned migrants while in the United States.

Taggart says:

> "If there is such a thing as a secondary labor market, the Puerto Ricans in New York are clearly most entwined in it. The jobs available to them for the most part are low paying and unattractive.
>
> "In every major occupation Puerto Rican males and females earn less than the average for all other employees. In professional and technical positions Puerto Rican males earn 80% of the weekly median for all workers in such occupations; and Puerto Rican females earn only 76% as much as all women.
>
> "The Puerto Rican population is younger than the poverty area average. Since employment problems tend to decline with age, this may explain some of the observed differences in labor market success.
>
> "The data indicates that Puerto Ricans have much more restricted employment horizons than other poverty area residents. For instance, 26.1% of the employed Puerto Ricans worked within the surveyed poverty areas compared with only 22.4% of all residents. For females, the differences are even more marked, with 34.7% of the Puerto Rican women employed in the surveyed areas compared with 25.0% of all other women."

In order to conclude, we would like to emphasize that the phenomenon of Puerto Rican migration seems to occur in a particular way to our people, and not as a repetition of the migratory experience of other ethnic groups which have become acculturated and assimilated to the United States environment. Thus, the Puerto Rican migration requires urgent sophisticated research, a research that has to include the Puerto Rican migrants at the end of both of the migration streams that is, the returned migrants in Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rican migrants in the United States.

References

1. U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P. 20 No. 238.

2. U.S. Department of Commerce, U. S. Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics: Puerto Rico PC (1) - C 53 P.R., U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., Tables 41, 43 - 44.

3. Hernândez Alvarez, Josê. Return Migration to Puerto Rico. Berkeley, California: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1967, p. 153.

4. Torres-Zayas, Josê A. "The Puerto Rican in New York: A Case-Study of Psycho-sociological Alienation". The Economic Weekly: A Journal of Current Economic and Political Affairs, Volume XV, Nos. 28, 29 and 30, July 1963. U. S. A.

5. Piore, Michael. "Puerto Rican Migration and Labor Market Implications". Final Report Conference on Puerto Rican Migration and Migrants, Section on Labor Market Implications. (R 41) National Manpower Policy Task Force, U.S. Department of Labor, June 1973.

6. Taggart, Robert. "The Socio-economic Status of Puerto Ricans in New York City Poverty Areas", Ibid, p. 57.

Selected Bibliography on Puerto Rican Migration

Burnight, Robert. Estimates of Net Migration, Mèxico 1930-1950, Paper Presented in the International Population Conference, Paper No. 42.

Dworkis, Martin B. The impact of Puerto Rican Migration on Governmental Services in New York City. New York: N.Y. University Press. 1957. p. 74.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph. Puerto Rican Americans: The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland. New Jersey: Prentice Hall: 1971. p. 192.

Francis, Roy. The Predictive Process. Rio Piedras: Social Science Research Center, U.P.R., p. 143.

Garcia Olivero, Carmen. Study of the Initial Involment in the Social Services by the Puerto Rican Migrant in Philadelphia. New York: Vantage, 1968.

Handlin, Oscar. The Newcomers-Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Chancing Metropolis, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. p. 171.

Hernândez Alvarez, Josè. Return Migration to Puerto Rico. Berkeley, California. Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1967. 153 p.

Howard, J. Puerto Ricans: The Awakening Minorities. Chicago, Aldine, 1970. p. 189.

Macisco, John, Leôn Bouvier, and Martha Renzi. Migration Status, Education and Fertility in Puerto Rico, 1960, published by: Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, April 1969, Vol. XLVII, No. 2, pp. 167-187.

Monserrat, Joseph. Puerto Rican Migration. Migration Division, Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Mimeo), 1968.

McWilliams, C. Brothers Under the Skin. Little Brown and Co., 1942.

National Manpower Policy Task Force. Final Report: Conference on Puerto Rican Migration and Migrants, (Mimeo), June 1973.

Nieves-Falcón, Luis. Emigración puertorriqueña, sueño y realidad. Diagnóstico de Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras: Edil, 1970.

Padilla, Elena. Up from Puerto Rico. New York, Columbia University Press: 1958, p. 316.

Planificación, Junta de (Negociado de Planificación Social). La Población y sus Implicaciones. (Mimeo.), mayo 1972.

Rogler, Lloyd. Migrant in the City. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Rossi, Peter. Why Families Move. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.

Ruiz, Paquita. Vocational Needs of Puerto Rican Migrants. Rio Piedras, Centro de Investigaciones Sociales: U. P. R., 1947.

Seda-Bonilla, Eduardo. Réquiem por una cultura. Rio Piedras, Edil: 1970.

Senior, Clarence. The Puerto Ricans: Strangers then Neighbors. Chicago: Quadrangle Books. 1965, p. 123.

Senior, Clarence, and Donald Watkins. Towards a Balance Sheet of Puerto Rican Migration. In: Status of Puerto Rico: Selected Background Studies, for the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966. pp. 689-795.

Vázquez-Calzada, José. "La Emigración Puertorriqueña: ¿Solución o Problema?" Revista de Ciencias Sociales, Vol. VII, No. 4.

________________. Las Causas y Efectos de la Emigración Puertorriqueña. (Mimeo.) Universidad de Puerto Rico, Escuela de Medicina, Departamento de Medicina Preventiva y Salud Pública, Sección de Estudios Demográficos. Octubre 1968, p. 40.

Wakefield, D. Island in the City. New York: Riverside Press, 1959.